

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to any paper(s) indicated above, and is responsive in any other manner indicated below.

COMMENTS RE NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT

It is respectfully noted that the 11 January 2006 Notice Of Non-Compliant Amendment cites Applicant's 26 October 2005 Request For Complete Office Action, and not Applicant's more recent 09 January 2006 Amendment.

It is respectfully submitted that the 11 January 2006 Notice Of Non-Compliant Amendment is confusing in a number of ways. First, the Undersigned cannot understand the continuation comments stating "It should be noted that none of the record of the restriction requirement was mailed to the applicant before the non-final rejection dated on 10/07/05." That is, the 07 October 2005 Restriction Requirement was mailed to Applicant, and was received, and the Undersigned does not know that "the record" in the comments refers to. As a second point of confusion, it is noted that the body of the Notice Of Non-Compliant Amendment was authored by Examiner Tuan C. TO, while the cover page of the communication indicated Jack W. KEITH as the assigned Examiner. Third, Applicant's 26 October 2005 Request For Complete Office Action was not an amendment, and accordingly, the Undersigned does not know how it can be a "Non-Compliant Amendment".

In any event, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's 09 January 2006 Amendment fully and adequately responded to the 07 October 2005 Office Action. This present Response reiterates Applicant's 09 January 2006 claims in clean form, and reiterates a revised version of Applicant's 09 January 2006 arguments. It is

respectfully submitted that the 26 October 2005 Request For Complete Office Action (and corresponding 11 January 2006 Notice Of Non-Compliant Amendment) has been rendered moot in view of the recent Amendment and this present Response.

PENDING CLAIMS

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 are pending, and under consideration. At entry of this paper, Claims 1-6 and 8-17 remain pending for further consideration and examination in the application.

ALL REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC '102 AND '103 - TRAVERSED

All 35 USC 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully traversed. However, such rejections have been rendered obsolete by the present clarifying amendments to Applicant's claims, and accordingly, traversal arguments are not appropriate at this time. However, Applicant respectfully submits the following to preclude renewal of any such rejections against Applicant's clarified claims.

All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed.

Unrelated to any prior art rejection, claim 7 has now been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering this rejection of such claims obsolete at this

time. Patentability of remaining ones of the rejected claims are supported as follows.

In order to properly support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection, any applied art reference must disclose each and every limitation of any rejected claim. The applied art does not adequately support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection because, at minimum, such applied art does not disclose (or suggest) the following discussed limitations of Applicant's claims.

As to Claim 1, some important features of claim 1 is to search for land mark facilities (e.g., parking lots, stores) responsive to a facilities request in a land mark database, and to generate a summary road map by applying a summarizing operation over a main road including a running route and the searched land mark. This is supported by the description in paragraphs [0013] and [0069] in US Patent Application Publication No.2004-0236507 of this application. For example, when a driver hopes to get a parking area, if the car navigation system merely performs a magnifying processing or a summarizing processing, the system cannot display a small (i.e., geographically small) parking area. In the present invention, land mark facilities determined by a user's facilities request is searched, and the summarizing operation is applied to the searched land marks. As a result, even if the searched land marks includes a small parking area, such a small parking area can be displayed (refer to paragraph (00693 of the US Publication), e.g., by inserting an icon onto the map.

The cited Endo (US'552) reference discloses that a user can select one of two-dimensional map bird's-eye view display or three-dimensional map bird's-eye view display. However, the Endo reference does not disclose to generate a

summary road map, or to search a facilities land mark determined by a facilities request to summarize the searched land marks, as in the present invention.

As to Claim 3, some important features of Claim 3 is to search a route between a vehicle position or a departure position and a target position, to generate a summary road map by simplifying the route with broken lines (not dotted lines) and to display the summary road map. This is supported by the description in paragraphs [0015], [0016], [0092] and Fig.9 of the US Publication No.'507.

Accordingly, a desired route between the departure or the vehicle position and the target position is clearly indicated by a simplified broken line as shown in Applicant's Fig.9 and therefore the driver can readily recognize the entire route (refer to paragraphs [0091], [0092] and [0171] the US Publication).

The cited Sato (US'400) reference merely indicates a guidance route GR1 leading to the destination by a broken line along a crank-shaped bent road as shown in Sato's Fig.4. Sato's invention is to provide a vehicle navigation system which can offer information for reliable navigation to a destination even when a vehicle has entered a minor street (refer to paragraph [0012] of the reference). That is to say, when a vehicle enters a minor street, a route to the destination is again searched and the searched route is displayed on the screen in an enlarged form (refer to paragraph [0069] of Sato). The enlarged display causes a user to readily recognize a route, but a route to the destination is not displayed on the screen (refer to paragraph [0044] of the reference Sato).

Therefore, Sato does not disclose the features of Claim 3 that the route between the vehicle position or the departure position and the target position is displayed in a summarized form shown by specialized lines as the present invention.

The cited reference Endo also does not disclose to simplify the route by indicating the specialized lines, as shown in the Examiner' s comment.

As to Claim 9, some important features of Claim 9 is to generate a summary road map from the current vehicle position to a next turning corner on the searched running route, and to display the summary road map from the current vehicle position to the next turning corner with a mark of the current vehicle position. This is supported by paragraphs [0099], [0101], [0107] and Fig.12 of the US Publication '507.

In the present invention, not only an intersection, but also a route from the present vehicle position to a next intersection can be displayed, and a driver can easily know the state of the running route up to the next intersection (refer to paragraphs [0099] and [0172]). Accordingly, the visual understanding of the user is improved, and the user can pass through a main intersection smoothly (refer to paragraphs [0101], [0109], [0121] and others).

On the other hand, the cited Yamashita (US'984) reference discloses to guide a driver on a recommended lane to be taken at both entering an intersection and exiting therefrom (refer to paragraphs [0011] and [0013]). Yamashita further discloses to search a map data including an area from the departure point to the destination point (refer to paragraph [0057]). The recommended lane is displayed on an enlarged map only at an intersection as shown in Fig.4, but the Yamashita reference displays neither a route from the present vehicle position to an intersection, nor a mark of the current vehicle position. Accordingly, Yamashita does not disclose a summary map from the present vehicle position to a next turning point with a mark of the current vehicle position, as the present invention.

As to Claim 4, some important features of Claim 4 is to search for another route between the vehicle position or the departure position and the target position, and to display the searched another route by differing specialized (e.g., simplified broken) lines. This is supported in paragraph [0016] and Fig.9 of the US' 507.

The cited Hirota reference discloses in Fig.3 and column 7, lines 43-49, to search a plurality of readable routes and to display all the routes. However, the reference does not disclose to display routes to a target position by simplified broken lines.

As to Claim 13, some important features of claim 13 is that the display unit displays a simplified route by broken lines without a map (refer to paragraph [0096] and Figs.9 and 10). By doing so, the route is clearly displayed so that the user can readily recognize the entire route (refer to [0171] of the US Publication). Such features of the present invention are not disclosed in any cited references.

As to Claim 5, an important feature of claim 5 is that with respect to the corresponding route displayed thereon (refer to paragraph [0096] and Fig. 11).

The cited reference Hikita (USP'463) discloses in column 6, lines 7-15, that it is possible to judge as to whether or not the route is again searched based on a relationship between an arrival time during which the moving object reaches the traffic jam or traffic restriction region, and a decreasing time during which this traffic jam or traffic restriction region is decreased. However, the reference does not disclose the features of the present invention that the display unit displays traffic information on the summary road map.

As to Claim 6, Hikita discloses in column 9, lines 53-58 to compare a first route including the traffic jam or restriction region and a second route not including

them and to display one of the first and second routes. But claim 6 defines to display a detour of a point of the traffic information which blocks the passage of the vehicle on the summary road map (refer to paragraph [0096] and Fig.11) and the features are not disclosed in the reference.

As to Claim 10, one important feature of claim 10 is that the predetermined range is broader than a display range of a magnified road map displayed for the next turning corner (refer to paragraph [0099]). As a result, the driver can know the summary up to the corner, even when the vehicle approaches the intersection at a great distance away therefrom (refer to paragraph [0099]).

On the other hand, the cited reference Sakamoto (US'585) discloses to change an area to be displayed in accordance with an age and driving record of a driver as shown in Figs. 9 and 10, but the reference does not disclose the above features of claim 10.

As to Claim 12, Endo discloses in Fig. 28A to display two-or three-dimensional map, but the reference does not disclose to make roads linear and make an intersection orthogonal to each other (refer to paragraph [0023]), as defined in claim 12.

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art would not support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection or '103 obviousness-type rejection of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such '102 and '103 rejections, and express written allowance of all of the rejected claims, are respectfully requested.

EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE

The Examiner is herein invited to telephone the undersigned attorneys at the local Washington, D.C. area telephone number of 703/312-6600 for discussing any Examiner's Amendments or other suggested actions for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer. That is, any above statements, or any present amendment or cancellation of claims (all made without prejudice or disclaimer), should not be taken as an indication or admission that any objection/rejection was valid, or as a disclaimer of any scope or subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above as presently being under consideration in the application are now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR '1.136. Authorization is herein given to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 500.43576X00) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Based upon all of the foregoing, allowance of all presently-pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Paul J. Skwierawski
Registration No. 32,173

PJS/slk
(703) 312-6600